

From: Kathleen Abernathy
To: KAQUINN
Date: Fri. Mar 28, 2003 3:30 PM
Subject: Fwd: Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

From: seal943@patriot.net
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, Mar 28, 2003 3:30 PM
Subject: Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Dear FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy,

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that use local media for advertising.

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from Congress and the public will help the Commission see the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

I encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a meaningful period of time for the public to review and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not less, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.

Sincerely,

Steph Lovelady
7800 Carroll Ave.
Takoma Park, Maryland 20912

From: Jennifer Osborne
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, Mar 28, 2003 4:19 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

Dear Commissioner:

Regarding the upcoming FCC vote, further consolidation of the media must be halted and in fact reversed. TV and radio news in the hands of a handful of profit-driven corporations has undermined our democracy more than any other modern force except the high cost of broadcast commercials during elections.

The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide crucial unbiased information to the public about most public issues, most notably the

drive to war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy,

I call on

you to break up the media conglomerates, to open the spectrum to a wide diversity of organizations and independent journalists, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine.

Thank you,

Jennifer Osborne
Los Angeles

Do you Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Platinum - Watch CBS' NCAA March Madness, live on your desktop!
<http://platinum.yahoo.com>

From: Tradval@aol.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Fri, Mar 28, 2003 4:23 PM
Subject: COMMON SENSE, NOT POLITICIANS, RULES MANS DESTINY!

Memo to Commissioner Copps:

I fully support the American Free Press of Washington, D.C. in its opposition to a MEDIA MONOPOLY!
WHO GAVE THE MEDIA THE POWE TO CONTROL MEN'S LIVES!? NOBODY! THE MEDIA
REPRESENT THIEVERY! BRAINWASHING! DIABOLICALLY STEALING MEN'S MINDS!

As it is, government has unconstitutionally monopolized the lives of Americans:

It tells you who you are,
 why you are,
 what you are,
 where you are, and
 when and how you are this way!

HUMAN BEINGS ARE CREATED BY GOD! NOT MEN!

MANKIND STOLE THE POWER FROM GOD! HE NOW STEALS HIS GOD-GIVEN RIGHTS FROM ALL
HUMANITY! HE IS AN EXPERT IN GETTING INTO MESSES!

ESPECIALLY THE IRAQUIAN MESS HE IS NOW IN!

Victor E. Zino
(tradval)

CC: Tradval@aol.com

From: Kathleen Abernathy
To: KAQUINN
Date: Sat, Mar 29, 2003 1:24 AM
Subject: Fwd: With all due respect Sir

From: NadinB@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy. Michael Copps. KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, Mar 29, 2003 1:24 AM
Subject: With all due respect Sir

Nadin Abbott
1979 D Hammond Cri
Honolulu, HI 96818

Dear Sirs:

With all due respect but not only are further public hearings on further concentration of the media are needed, but in fact we should consider reenacting Fair Access Laws.

This is not a kneejerk reaction but one based on history.

When those Fair Access Rules were removed by President Reagan (as was needed for renewal of licenses) the silencing of voices began. The excuse was the market, but a view of chiefly the AM Radio these days is one inimical to a Democracy, but closer to any Authoritarian regime.

These days you can turn to any of the Right Wing programs in the AM Dial and hear the talking points of the day. they have nothing to do with fact. What they tend to do is more of personal attacks, personal destruction and closing the debate. This is not what the founding fathers meant as a free press, or what the Radio chiefly should be used for. Many of the statements made on any AM show are down right slanderous, yet they can get away with it, and most glaringly. alternate points of view cannot enter the discussion. I must ask, why is Sandy Rhodes not syndicated on Clear Channel? It is quite simple, she is not syndicated because she does not tote the ideological line and Clear Channel (with clear connections to the White House by the way, through Hicks) will not allow alternate views in talk shows or for that matter in music.

Now you tell me you want to remove the last limits to ownership. I know that from a business perspective this means only one News Room to serve a market instead of three or four. This also means a further closing of avenues of communication and discussion.

I must admit, this take over of the media, achieved over the last 10 years (and I blame both Democrats and Republicans) is very similar to that achieved in many authoritarian societies. Such as the USSR. Izvestia and Pravda had to get permission to publish even neutral editorials against the regime. One of the measures that Perestroika pushed was the opening of the media ... which led to the demise of the Party's organ, Pravda, which in the end was a good thing. Why did they fall? Russians knew it was a tool of the state.

US Media is not there yet, but not far from it, as coverage and discussion and debate around the war has proven. The opposition has all but been ignored, until it was way too large to ignore. Nobody who has valid points is allowed on the air, or if they are, they are screamed at ... because they are the loony left. It gets worst than that. We have people in the AM world calling people to intimidate or worst any person who opposes this. At this point it does not matter what my stand is on this war, just the observations, that the US Media is allowed a very small editorial Point of View since it is hyperconcentrated in the hands of six extremely large corporations. More glaringly, that personal threats are allowed to go on the air, with apparent impunity. (May I remind you of Gordon Liddy's suggestion that to kill Federal Agents back in '92 you only had to shoot them in the head? This has become the rule, not the exception, and Liddy is still on the air. see what I mean about blaming both sides of the Aisle?)

In other words there is no longer a mainstream left media, but boy there is a very well funded, mainstream Right Wing to extreme Right Wing Media ... and the homogeneity among the AM dial is reminiscent of Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia. (Yes, I am a trained Historian.) The papers are not yet as bad, and the

IV ... well CNN is Izvestial and FOX is Pravda

Shame on you Mister Powell thinking that you are doing a service to the country by further concentrating the debate and stifling dissenting views. Yes, those who own the microphone control the message and it is time that you, and the rest of the FCC think of the good of the nation and surprise all of us by starting the reform needed to once again make our media the tool of a functioning democracy it should be. When the media becomes a megaphone for any party (the RW media has) we are one step away from a dictatorship of ideas.

It is so bad Sir, that these days I rarely listen to US Media, since quite frankly I cannot stand megaphones, and if they were megaphones for the other side I would be asking the same. I have taken to listening to British Media, Canadian, Australian, you get the picture. Every once in a while I do turn on US TV hoping that they have realized they have lost a good chunk of the viewership. You may not know this but Short Wave Radios have gone up in sales quite significantly ... you and the rest of the FCC should start wondering why

Upton Sinclair said at one time that the job of the media was to make those in power neither comfortable or at ease. Our media no longer does that with the a particular section of the political spectrum, and when Al Jazeera starts lecturing us about a free and independent media (Yes they are as much propaganda as Fox, just another side of the same bloody coin) you should get worried.

Thanks for listening, and consider this Public Comment.

Sincerely,

Nadin Abbott
A very Concerned American

cc

US Senator Akaha
US Senator Inouye
US Congressman Abercrombie

CC: senator@akaka.senate.gov, neil.abercrombie@mail.house.gov..fcc.gov

From: KathleenAbernathy
To: **KAQUINN**
Date: Sat, Mar 29, 2003 12:14 **PM**
Subject: Fwd: Further deregulation of the media

From: MarimikeG@cs.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, mkopps@fcc.gov, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, Mar 29, 2003 12:14 PM
Subject: Further deregulation of the media

Dear Sirs:

I will be giving the following as testimony at the public hearing scheduled Monday, March 31 at the Duke Law School in Durham, NC. Please read and consider these points while considering your decision on the changes you propose for media ownership.

Michael Elvin
Fuquay-Varina, NC

Further deregulation a bad idea for Americans

Dear Sirs--

The purpose of government regulation is to achieve a common good of a sort that cannot be achieved strictly through the free reign of market processes. Regulation limiting the conglomeration of media resources is one such instance where controls are required. The availability of bandwidth is limited, and it is possible for one group to have an unnatural monopoly that limits what the public may hear to a very limited selection of voices.

A classic example is the Dixie Chicks boycott. This was presented to the public as being a spontaneous, grass-roots response to a politically unpopular opinion by one of the group's members. Politically unpopular as considered by whom, you may ask? It turns out that nearly all the radio stations simultaneously announcing this boycott appear to be owned by the same person, a man named Tom Hicks.

Mr Hicks turns out to be an old business associate of our president, George Bush. He is also the owner of Clear Channels, a nationwide conglomerate that owns some 1200 stations. In some cities, Clear Channels affiliates form over half the market. Their ability to exercise influence over the opinions of viewers, as well as to shut out competing opinion by becoming able to swallow up the competition, is obvious. It is also clearly not in the public interest.

In January, 2002 there was a train wreck in Minot, N.D. that released a cloud of anhydrous ammonia. The local police dispatcher attempted to notify local radio, television and cable suppliers to issue an evacuation alert. He found that none of the seven radio stations were truly local. As they all were running on satellite

feeds, there was no one to contact to interrupt the programming. He then attempted to contact the five local television stations. Two were off the air. The other three were on satellite feeds, and had no one at the station. He then tried to contact the cable supplier.

The cable interrupt system failed, the old EBS radio emergency system failed and the newer EAS system was inactive due to the large volume of 911 calls clogging the system. Before one local television station owner could be called at home and awakened, one person died.

This is precisely the sort of circumstance that led to the formation of the FCC, as it presents a clear danger to the public. Fifty years ago, a single phone call would have reached the all-night deejay on duty and he would have instantly interrupted the music to make an emergency announcement.

In post-911 times it becomes more important than ever that there be instant access to local broadcasters so that such emergencies can be handled effectively.

There is also the matter of employment. Forty years ago every small community in America had one or several local broadcasters, employing **DJ's**, announcers, support and technical staff, ad sales people, etcetera. Employment is a good thing. Government should be in the business of endorsing policies that promote fuller employment.

A Clear Channel station consists of a little cinderblock box with a huge antenna rising from it. You've seen these "stations" driving through the country. They employ two technicians to monitor the signal, and that's it. So much for employment.

There is a more ominous reason control of the media should be broadened and not restricted to the very few. It used to be in the old Soviet Union that there were only five presets on the radio dial. On each of the five stations available you got a government channel. If you wanted to access any other station you had to reconfigure your tuner. Thus there was a monopoly on programming.

It's true, at the moment ownership of the dwindling number of media outlets remains in private hands, but we live in an age where government interests and corporate interests are increasingly coming to be identified in the same people. And it is also the case that any monopoly on information must be seen as a bad thing. Should a large television-radio-cable-computer empire come to be owned by an extremist of any persuasion, is it right that his voice alone should get to be heard by the public?

**

Finally, there is the argument that when big government intervenes in business it must do so only to serve the public interest. It may not do so in order to support one segment of the business community at the expense of the other segments, or at the expense of the public interest. That mission statement is

contained in the charter document of the Federal Communications Commission, I am confident

Should the FCC permit the proposed rule changes, the playing field would be tilted in favor of the largest media conglomerates, and away from the small, independent station owners that are also a part of the American scene. In a given community, the television, cable, radio and newspaper could all be owned by the same individual, and anyone in disagreement with his focus would find themselves out of work.

Such a move would reduce the opportunities available to every small business person and every print or broadcast employee. It would enhance the already mighty powers of a tiny group of media oligarchs like Ted Turner, Rupert Murdoch, Michael Eisner and Tom Hicks. Regardless of their orientation, I do not want these few people to manage the total news flow available to the public.

Thank you for your consideration.

Michael Elvin
Fuquay-Varina, **NC**

From: MarimikeG@cs.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy. mkopps@fcc.gov. KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, Mar 29, 2003 12:14 PM
Subject: Further deregulation of the media

Dear Sirs:

I will be giving the following as testimony at the public hearing scheduled Monday, March 31 at the Duke Law School in Durham, NC. Please read and consider these points while considering your decision on the changes you propose for media ownership.

Michael Elvin
Fuquay-Varina, NC

Further deregulation a bad idea for Americans

Dear Sirs--

The purpose of government regulation is to achieve a common good of a sort that cannot be achieved strictly through the free reign of market processes. Regulation limiting the conglomeration of media resources is one such instance where controls are required. The availability of bandwidth is limited, and it is possible for one group to have an unnatural monopoly that limits what the public may hear to a very limited selection of voices.

A classic example is the Dixie Chicks boycott. This was presented to the public as being a spontaneous, grass-roots response to a politically unpopular opinion by one of the group's members. Politically unpopular as considered by whom, you may ask? It turns out that nearly all the radio stations simultaneously announcing this boycott appear to be owned by the same person, a man named Tom Hicks.

Mr Hicks turns out to be an old business associate of our president, George Bush. He is also the owner of Clear Channels, a nationwide conglomerate that owns some 1200 stations. In some cities, Clear Channels affiliates form over half the market. Their ability to exercise influence over the opinions of viewers, as well as to shut out competing opinion by becoming able to swallow up the competition, is obvious. It is also clearly not in the public interest.

In January, 2002 there was a train wreck in Minot, N.D. that released a cloud of anhydrous ammonia. The local police dispatcher attempted to notify local radio, television and cable suppliers to issue an evacuation alert. He found that none of the seven radio stations were truly local. As they all were running on satellite

feeds, there was no one to contact to interrupt the programming. He then attempted to contact the five local television stations. Two were off the air. The other three were on satellite feeds, and had no one at the station. He then tried to contact the cable supplier.

The cable interrupt system failed, the old EBS radio emergency system failed and the newer EAS system was inactive due to the large volume of 911 calls clogging the system. Before one local television station owner could be called at home and awakened, one person died.

This is precisely the sort of circumstance that led to the formation of the FCC, as it presents a clear danger to the public. Fifty years ago, a single phone call would have reached the all-night deejay on duty and he would have instantly interrupted the music to make an emergency announcement.

In post-911 times it becomes more important than ever that there be instant access to local broadcasters so that such emergencies can be handled effectively.

There is also the matter of employment. Forty years ago every small community in America had one or several local broadcasters, employing DJ's, announcers, support and technical staff, ad sales people, etcetera. Employment is a good thing. Government should be in the business of endorsing policies that promote fuller employment.

A Clear Channel station consists of a little cinderblock box with a huge antenna rising from it. You've seen these "stations" driving through the country. They employ two technicians to monitor the signal, and that's it. So much for employment.

There is a more ominous reason control of the media should be broadened and not restricted to the very few. It used to be in the old Soviet Union that there were only five presets on the radio dial. On each of the five stations available you got a government channel. If you wanted to access any other station you had to reconfigure your tuner. Thus there was a monopoly on programming.

It's true, at the moment ownership of the dwindling number of media outlets remains in private hands, but we live in an age where government interests and corporate interests are increasingly coming to be identified in the same people. And it is also the case that any monopoly on information must be seen as a bad thing. Should a large television-radio-cable-computer empire come to be owned by an extremist of any persuasion, is it right that his voice alone should get to be heard by the public?

Finally, there is the argument that when big government intervenes in business it must do so only to serve the public interest. It may not do so in order to support one segment of the business community at the expense of the other segments, or at the expense of the public interest. That mission statement is

contained in the charter document of the Federal Communications Commission, I am confident

Should the FCC permit the proposed rule changes, the playing field would be tilted in favor of the largest media conglomerates, and away from the small, independent station owners that are also a part of the American scene. In a given community, the television, cable, radio and newspaper could all be owned by the same individual, and anyone in disagreement with his focus would find themselves out of work.

Such a move would reduce the opportunities available to every small business person and every print or broadcast employee. It would enhance the already mighty powers of a tiny group of media oligarchs like Ted Turner, Rupert Murdoch, Michael Eisner and Tom Hicks. Regardless of their orientation, I do not want these few people to manage the total news flow available to the public.

Thank you for your consideration.

Michael Elvin
Fuquay-Varina, NC

From: MarimikeG@cs.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, mkopps@fcc.gov. KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, Mar 29, 2003 12:14 PM
Subject: Further deregulation of the media

Dear Sirs:

I will be giving the following as testimony at the public hearing scheduled Monday, March 31 at the Duke Law School in Durham, NC. Please read and consider these points while considering your decision on the changes you propose for media ownership.

Michael Elvin
Fuquay-Varina, NC

Further deregulation a bad idea for Americans

Dear Sirs--

The purpose of government regulation is to achieve a common good of a sort that cannot be achieved strictly through the free reign of market processes. Regulation limiting the conglomeration of media resources is one such instance where controls are required. The availability of bandwidth is limited, and it is possible for one group to have an unnatural monopoly that limits what the public may hear to a very limited selection of voices.

A classic example is the Dixie Chicks boycott. This was presented to the public as being a spontaneous, grass-roots response to a politically unpopular opinion by one of the group's members. Politically unpopular as considered by whom, you may ask? It turns out that nearly all the radio stations simultaneously announcing this boycott appear to be owned by the same person, a man named Tom Hicks.

Mr Hicks turns out to be an old business associate of our president, George Bush. He is also the owner of Clear Channels, a nationwide conglomerate that owns some 1200 stations. In some cities, Clear Channels affiliates form over half the market. Their ability to exercise influence over the opinions of viewers, as well as to shut out competing opinion by becoming able to swallow up the competition, is obvious. It is also clearly not in the public interest.

In January, 2002 there was a train wreck in Minot, N.D. that released a cloud of anhydrous ammonia. The local police dispatcher attempted to notify local radio, television and cable suppliers to issue an evacuation alert. He found that none of the seven radio stations were truly local. As they all were running on satellite

feeds, there was no one to contact to interrupt the programming. He then attempted to contact the five local television stations. Two were off the air. The other three were on satellite feeds, and had no one at the station. He then tried to contact the cable supplier.

The cable interrupt system failed, the old *EBS* radio emergency system failed and the newer **EAS** system was inactive due to the large volume of 911 calls clogging the system. Before one local television station owner could be called at home and awakened, one person died.

This is precisely the sort of circumstance that led to the formation of the FCC, as it presents a clear danger to the public. Fifty years ago, a single phone call would have reached the all-night dee jay on duty and he would have instantly interrupted the music to make an emergency announcement.

In post-911 times it becomes more important than ever that there be instant access to local broadcasters so that such emergencies can be handled effectively.

There is also the matter of employment. Forty years ago every small community in America had one or several local broadcasters, employing **DJ's**, announcers, support and technical staff, ad sales people, etcetera. Employment is a good thing. Government should be in the business of endorsing policies that promote fuller employment.

A Clear Channel station consists of a little cinderblock box with a huge antenna rising from it. You've seen these "stations" driving through the country. They employ two technicians to monitor the signal, and that's it. So much for employment.

There is a more ominous reason control of the media should be broadened and not restricted to the very few. It used to be in the old Soviet Union that there were only five presets on the radio dial. On each of the five stations available you got a government channel. If you wanted to access any other station you had to reconfigure your tuner. Thus there was a monopoly on programming.

It's true, at the moment ownership of the dwindling number of media outlets remains in private hands, but we live in an age where government interests and corporate interests are increasingly coming to be identified in the same people. And it is also the case that any monopoly on information must be seen as a bad thing. Should a large television-radio-cable-computer empire come to be owned by an extremist of any persuasion, is it right that his voice alone should get to be heard by the public?

Finally, there is the argument that when big government intervenes in business it must do so only to **serve** the public interest. It may not do so in order to support one segment of the business community at the expense of the other segments, or at the expense of the public interest. That mission statement is

contained in the charter document of the Federal Communications Commission, I am confident

Should the FCC permit the proposed rule changes, the playing field would be tilted in favor of the largest media conglomerates, and away from the small, independent station owners that are also a part of the American scene. In a given community, the television, cable, radio and newspaper could all be owned by the same individual, and anyone in disagreement with his focus would find themselves out of work.

Such a move would reduce the opportunities available to every small business person and every print or broadcast employee. It would enhance the already mighty powers of a tiny group of media oligarchs like Ted Turner, Rupert Murdoch, Michael Eisner and Tom Hicks. Regardless of their orientation, I do not want these few people to manage the total news flow available to the public.

Thank you for your consideration.

Michael Elvin
Fuquay-Varina, NC

From: Marilyn Harmer
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, Mar 29, 2003 8:02 PM
Subject: Media Monopoly

Thank you for opposing the media's monopoly's continuing grab for greater power.

Marilyn E. Harmer

Get more from the Web. FREE MSN Explorer download : <http://explorer.msn.com>

From: Jmpang@aol.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sun, Mar 30, 2003 2:28 AM
Subject: (no subject)

Dear Mr. Copps:

I am writing to urge you to continue to oppose efforts to relax media ownership rules. This **is** NOT what the public wants. Too few huge corporations already own too many radio and TV stations and newspapers. This compromises the quality, objectivity and variety of news and music that we are able to get.

For example, Clear Channel Communications, which owns over 1200 radio stations, not to mention concert venues and other things, puts a slant to their news content, and controls artists with their overwhelming power. They have gotten around the 1st Amendment and banned certain 'unpatriotic' songs from their radio stations. Who is served when outlets are allowed to consolidate? Not the public. I believe that the airways are owned by the public. A handful of corporations should not get control of them.

Sincerely,
Judy Pang
Palos Verdes Estates

From: Clyde Tucker
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sun, Mar 30, 2003 8:47 PM
Subject: Media Ownership Concentration

Dear Mr. Powell,

I am strongly opposed to any additional concentration of media ownership. We already have excessive concentration. Clear Channel domination of radio station ownership is a major example. With such domination we effectively have "corporate censorship" over news that is covered. If news is not in the best interest of the parent corporation - it is not carried.

Programming and music choices appear to be made to best suit the interests of the corporation and are remarkably unresponsive to audience requests.

Similar problems already occur with *IN* networks being owned by large corporations. News stories that are not in the best interest of the parent corporation - again - do not appear.

None of the commercial TV or radio stations that I listen to have carried stories about the "media concentration" that they are apparently urging. It is only through our private newspaper, National Public Radio, and Public Television that I learned of this proposal. That is yet another example of the news censorship that corporations **use** - when stories do not serve their own interests.

If such corporations are allowed to control newspapers and radio or TV stations they will have virtually total control of the information received by the public. That certainly would not be in the best interest of the public.

The FCC must not allow single entities to control such great portions of the information flow to the public. If anything, the concentration should be decreased - not increased. The radio spectrum is supposed to be owned by the public and used in the best interest of the public. It is not supposed to be monopolized in the interest of a few corporations.

Clyde Tucker
7135 N Alpine Drive
Parker, CO 80134

From: Jeff Berard
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Mar 31, 2003 1:26 AM
Subject: Media Cross Ownership Laws

Chairman Powell:

I urge you to consider the potential harm our democracy would suffer by relaxing the cross ownership rules for media companies. Politics aside, a functioning democracy demands that divergent voices be considered, heard, and represented. The relaxation or removal of existing media cross ownership laws could forever destroy the fabric that America was created from.

Could you imagine for a moment if the civil rights movement received no press coverage, or if Watergate was never exposed to the public simply because it conflicted with the interests of a large conglomerate? There are perhaps thousands of such examples I could cite.

This **is** not a pro business/anti business issue, it is however an issue of democracy. Media consolidation has consistently homogenized the American voice. Perhaps a decision to relax the laws now **will** not fully demonstrate itself for years to come, but it will eventually lead to only one voice, and that Mister Chairman is not democracy, it is fascism.

It is my hope you will think outside of political lines, and consider the irreparable harm this could cause

Thank you,

Jeff Berard
Providence, Rhode Island

From: Linda Brewster
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Mon, Mar 31, 2003 9:58 AM
Subject: Keep media free and competitive

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the **American media** at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Linda Brewster
2853 E. Cobre Dr.
Phoenix, **AZ** 85028
Linda Brewster, Ph.D.
2853 E. Cobre Dr.
Phoenix, **AZ** 85028

From: Linda Brewster
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Mar 31, 2003 9:58 AM
Subject: Keep media free and competitive

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Linda Brewster
2853 E. Cobre Dr.
Phoenix, AZ 85028
Linda Brewster, Ph.D.
2853 E. Cobre Dr.
Phoenix, AZ 85028

From: Linda Brewster
To: Michael Copps
Date: Mon, Mar 31, 2003 9:58 AM
Subject: Keep media free and competitive

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Linda Brewster
2853 E. Cobre Dr.
Phoenix, AZ 85028
Linda Brewster, Ph.D
2853 E. Cobre Dr.
Phoenix, AZ 85028

From: Susan Moody
To: Michael Copps
Date: Mon, Mar 31, 2003 9:58 AM
Subject: FCC don't allow media monopolies

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Susan D. Moody
3720 E Tuttle Ave
Terre Haute, IN 47805-1940

From: Susan Moody
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Mar 31, 2003 9:58 AM
Subject: FCC don't allow media monopolies

Dear Commissioner Powell:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner Powell, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Susan D. Moody
3720 E Tuttle Ave
Terre Haute, IN 47805-1940

From: Linda Brewster
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon. Mar 31, 2003 9:58 AM
Subject: Keep media free and competitive

Dear Commissioner Powell:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner Powell, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Linda Brewster
2853 E. Cobre Dr.
Phoenix, AZ 85028
Linda Brewster, Ph.D
2853 E. Cobre Dr.
Phoenix, AZ 85028

From: Susan Moody
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Mar 31, 2003 9:58 AM
Subject: FCC don't allow media monopolies

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Susan D. Moody
3720 E Tuttle Ave
Terre Haute, IN 47805-1940

From: Elizabeth Jones
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Mon, Mar 31, 2003 9:58 AM
Subject: FCC protect media independence

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Jones
530 Divisadero ST #227
San Francisco, CA 94117

DO YOU YAHOO! Get your free @yahoo.com address at <http://mail.yahoo.com>

From: Elizabeth Jones
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Mar 31, 2003 9:58 AM
Subject: FCC protect media independence

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Jones
530 Divisadero ST #227
San Francisco, CA 94117

DO YOU YAHOO! Get your free @yahoo.com address at <http://mail.yahoo.com>

From: Elizabeth Jones
To: Michael Copps
Date: Mon, Mar 31, 2003 9:58 AM
Subject: FCC protect media independence

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Jones
530 Divisadero ST #227
San Francisco, CA 94117

DO YOU YAHOO! Get your free @yahoo.com address at
<http://mail.yahoo.com>

From: Elizabeth Jones
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Mar 31, 2003 9:58 AM
Subject: FCC protect media independence

Dear Commissioner Powell:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner Powell, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Jones
530 Divisadero ST #227
San Francisco, CA 94117

DO YOU YAHOO! Get your free @yahoo.com address at
<http://mail.yahoo.com>

From: Susan Moody
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Mon. Mar 31, 2003 9:58 AM
Subject: FCC don't allow media monopolies

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Susan D. Moody
3720 E Tuttle Ave
Terre Haute, IN 47805-1940

From: Linda Brewster
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Mar 31, 2003 9:59 AM
Subject: Don't allow monopoly of media channels

Dear Commissioner Powell:

Numerous reports agree that the Federal Communications is planning to loosen longstanding rules governing control of the media that bring news and views to the American public. This will inevitably lead to monopoly, by a few large corporate giants, of TV stations, newspapers, and broadcast networks.

I urge you, Commissioner Powell, to halt immediately any implementation of these these FCC plans that threaten public access to diverse views and information.

Sincerely,

Linda Brewster
2853 E. Cobre Dr.
Phoenix, AZ 85028
Linda Brewster, Ph.D
2853 E. Cobre Dr.
Phoenix, AZ 85028